57
53. (New) The method of claim 52, wherein the antivenom pharmaceutical composition is administered intravenously.

03

REMARKS

Appellants respectfully request examination of the claims in light of the Decision on Appeal. In the Decision on Appeal, the Board reversed the rejection of claims 40-42 and 45-47 (all the pending claims) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, vacated the rejection of claims 40-42 and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, and affirmed the rejection of claims 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Board also entered a new ground of rejection, rejecting claims 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Appellants file this amendment in response to this new ground of rejection.

Claim Amendments

For the Examiner's convenience, the amendments are illustrated in the accompanying appendix.

Appellants have cancelled claims 45-47, whose rejection the Board affirmed.

Appellants have also amended rejected claims 40-42 and added new claims 48-53 in response to the Board's new ground of rejection. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.196(b)(1)("Submit an appropriate amendment of the claims so rejected . . . and have the matter reconsidered by the examiner . . . ."). The M.P.E.P. indicates that, as long as the rejected claims are amended, new claims can also be added::

> An amendment which adds new claims without **either** amending the rejected claims, **or** substituting new claims for the rejected claims, is not appropriate.

M.P.E.P. § 1214.01 ("Procedure Following New Ground of Rejection by Board")(emphasis added). In other words, an amendment which adds new claims is

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

not appropriate only if it does not amend the rejected claims **and** it does not substitute new claims for the rejected claims. Thus, if the rejected claims are amended, or if new claims substitute for the rejected claims, the amendment is appropriate.

This sentence clearly reflects the PTO's current policy on this matter. It was not present in previous editions of the M.P.E.P. and was added to § 1214.01 in the most recent revision to the M.P.E.P. Because Appellants are amending the claims rejected by the Board, the amended and new claims are appropriate.

Appellants also note that new claims 52-53 are method claims that depend from product claims. Appellants would be entitled to present such claims after an indication of allowability of the product claims from which they depend. M.P.E.P. § 821.04 Rejoinder ("Where the application as originally filed discloses the product and the process for making and/or using the product, and only claims directed to the product are presented for examination, when a product claim is found allowable, applicant may present claims directed to the process of making and/or using the patentable product by way of amendment pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.") In order to expedite prosecution of this already appealed application, however, Appellants are presenting these claims now rather than present them after an indication of allowability of the product claims. *See id.* ("In view of the rejoinder procedure, and in order to expedite prosecution, Appellants are encouraged to present such process claims, preferably as dependent claims, in the application at an early stage of prosecution. Process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance.").

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at the following representative locations:

pharmaceutical composition for treating a snakebite victim
page 4, lines 35-40; page 23, lines 1-3

wherein said antivenom pharmaceutical composition neutralizes the lethality of the venom of a snake of the Crotalus genus
page 7, lines 31-39; pages 18-23 ("LETHALITY DETERMINATIONS")

wherein the Fab fragments are equine.
page 5, last sentence; page 10, last sentence

wherein the antivenom pharmaceutical composition is lyophilized
page 15, line 28 (ACP is lyophilized according to the PDR listing of record)

further comprising thimerosal
page 15, line 28 (ACP contains thimerosal according to the PDR listing of record)

Fab_2
Page 5, lines 17-34; claim 28

New Ground of Rejection

The Board entered a new ground of rejection for claims 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Sullivan in view of Coulter. [Paper No. 46 at 9-10.] Specifically, the Board asserted that the combination of Sullivan in view of Coulter taught all the elements of claim 40 except for the pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, which the Board found in Coulter's use of phosphate buffered saline. [Paper No. 45 at 9-10.]

The new ground of rejection was based upon the Board's belief that the recitation of an "antivenom composition" in the preamble did not result in the claims requiring a pharmaceutical activity. Specifically, the Board's assertion with regard to the combination of Sullivan and Coulter was based upon its affirmance of the rejection of independent claim 45, which differed from independent claim 40 by not reciting an

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

"antivenin composition." [Paper No. 46 at 9-10.] The Board affirmed the rejection of claim 40 because "[t]here is no requirement in this claim that the Fab fragments exhibit a pharmaceutical activity." [Paper No. 45 at 9; *see also* id. at 8 (""[A]ppellants place too great a weight on one potential use, as an antitoxin, of the claimed 'Fab fragments.'").] Similarly, the Board vacated the rejection of claims 40-42 and 45-47 because "both the examiner and appellants place far too great a weight on the term 'antivenom' in the preamble of [the] claimed composition." [Paper No. 46 at 7.]

Because the Board did not believe claims 40-42 required a pharmaceutical activity, they concluded one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Sullivan's IgG antivenom teachings with Coulter's teaching that Fab fragments improve the sensitivity of enzyme immunoassays (EIAs) "for use in EIAs to detect said venom." {Paper No. 46 at 9.] In other words, the Board believed that the combination of Sullivan and Coulter would have suggested using Fab antivenom fragments to detect Crotalus venom.

Appellants have amended claim 40 to expressly recite that the antivenom composition is an "antivenom *pharmaceutical* composition *for treating a snakebite victim.*" Moreover, Appellants have also amended claim 40 to recite that the antivenom pharmaceutical composition "*neutralizes the lethality of the venom of a snake of the Crotalus genus.*" Thus, there can be no doubt that this claim (as well as the remaining claims, which are similarly amended), now contains a "requirement . . . that the Fab fragments exhibit a pharmaceutical activity." The basis of the Board's rejection has therefore been removed, and Appellants respectfully request allowance of claims 40-42 and 48-53.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

This is not a case of merely stating a new us for an obvious composition, which the Board reminded the examiner and Appellants does not render composition claims patentable. [Paper No. 46 at 7, 9 (citing *In re Zierden*, 162 USPQ 102, 104 (CCPA 1969) and *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641, 644 (CCPA 1974) .] Rather, it is a case of the claims reciting terms that "define . . . some characteristic not found in th old composition." *Pearson*, 181 USPQ at 644. Such terms can "be used to distinguish a new from an old composition." *Id.*

As discussed in detail below, amended claim 40, as well as the remaining product claims, now recite such terms that define characteristics that patentably distinguish the claimed antivenom pharmaceutical composition from the antivenom composition of Sullivan combined with the EIA detection reagent of Coulter. Claims 49-50 further patentably distinguish the claimed composition from the prior art by reciting that the antivenom pharmaceutical composition is either lyophilized or also contains thimerosal. The undersigned is aware of no reason why a mere detection reagent for an EIA (Coulter's teaching relied upon by the Board) would be lyophilized or would contain thimerosal. In contrast, therapeutic pharmaceutical compositions are lyophilized to permit longer storage, and they often contain thimerosal as a preservative.

Moreover, in both *Pearson* and *Zierden*, the CCPA reversed the rejection of method claims that corresponded to the rejected product claims, allowing those method claims. *Pearson* 181 USPQ at 645-46; *Zierden*, 162 USPQ at 104-05. As the CCPA stated in *Zierden*, "there is express statutory authority for a patent on a process which is a new use of a known . . . composition of matter . . . . " *Zierden*, 162 USPQ at

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

104. Thus, even if the product claims were obvious, which Appellants dispute, the method claims need not be.

1. Before Appellants' Invention, Antivenoms Comprising Fab Fragments Were Expected to Be Ineffective in Neutralizing the Lethality of the Venom of a Snake of the Crotalus Genus

In any event, the combination of Sullivan and Coulter would not have rendered any of Appellants' claims obvious. Appellants have submitted numerous references and the Declarations of Dr. Damon Smith, Dr. John B. Sullivan, and Findley E. Russ II, M.D., Ph.D., which prove that, while the claimed invention might now appear to the Examiner, in hindsight, to be obvious, at the time of Appellants' invention, the claimed invention would not have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would not have had a reasonable expectation of success. Indeed, Dr. Sullivan "and others questioned whether anti-venom F(ab)'s would be effective [antivenoms]" [Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 9], and Dr. Sullivan and others actually believed that Fab fragments would "fail or **increase** toxicity of the venom." [Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 13; emphasis in original.]

The only commercially available antivenom at the time of Appellants' invention for North American snakes of the Crotalus genus was Antivenin [Crotalidae] Polyvalent (equine origin) ("ACP"), which first became available in 1947. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 20; Smith Decl. at ¶ 7.] This antivenom suffers the serious problem suffered by other antivenoms of often causing serum sickness, an allergic reaction to the antivenom that is sometimes as deleterious as the venom. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 20; specification at p. 4, lines 35-40.] Over 75% of envenomation patients who receive ACP suffer from serum sickness. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 20.] This danger can be so great that physicians may not administer this antivenom for some cases of envenomation, and

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

ACP can only be obtained in a kit that also contains test serum for possibly detecting serum sickness. [*Id.*]

Because of the serious problem of serum sickness, extensive research had been performed on developing better antivenoms. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 24.] As Appellants discussed above, it was generally believed that "given possession of the antibody active site, the smaller the antibody molecule, the better. [Specification at p. 3, lines 1-2.] Thus, much of this research focused on immunoglobulin fragments, which may not provoke an immune reaction. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 24.] In the late 1960's, researchers began experimenting with antivenoms comprising $F(ab)_2$ fragments, and such antivenoms first became commercially available in 1969. [*Id.*; Smith Decl. at ¶ 7.] Although the smaller size of the $F(ab)_2$ fragments results in less serum sickness, such antivenoms appeared less effective than antivenoms comprising whole immunoglobulin. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 25.] Consequently, Crotalidae antivenoms comprising $F(ab)_2$ fragments were not produced in the United States. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 24].

Although serum sickness had long been recognized as a major problem with antivenoms, and although smaller antibody fragments had long been known to be less immunogenic, no researcher developed antivenoms comprising the smaller Fab fragments prior to Appellants' invention. [*Id.* at ¶ 25; Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 5.] Indeed, there had been no significant improvements in commercial antivenoms since 1969, when an $F(ab)_2$ antivenom was commercially sold. [Smith Decl. at ¶ 7.] Development of antivenoms comprising antibody fragments halted at the larger $F(ab)_2$ fragments

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

becaus the larger $F(ab)_2$ fragments appeared to some of ordinary skill in the art to be less effective than whole antibody. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 25.]

Not only did the $F(ab)_2$ fragments, which are larger than Fab fragments, appear to be less effective than whole antibody molecules, but those of ordinary skill in the art expected Fab fragments to be even less effective than the disappointing $F(ab)_2$ fragments for several reasons. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 26; Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 5; Smith Decl. at ¶ 9.] First, Fab fragments cannot stearically hinder the binding of a venom protein to its tissue target as well as $F(ab)_2$ fragments because Fab fragments have only one active site. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 29; Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 8.] The two binding sites on $F(ab)_2$ fragments allow them to bind to repeating antigenic determinants on a venom antigen, and this repetitive determinant binding stearically hinders the venom antigen from binding to its active site.

Second, since $F(ab)_2$ fragments contain two antigen binding sites, each individual $F(ab)_2$ fragment can bind two antigens. [Steward Sell, *Basic Immunology: Immune Mechanisms in Health and Disease*, at p. 89, Fig. 6-3 (1987).] As more $F(ab)_2$ fragments cross-link more antigens, they form larger complexes which, eventually, become large enough that they precipitate from solution. *Id.* In contrast, since Fab fragments have only one antigen binding site, they cannot form cross-linked complexes and precipitate the antigens. [Smith Decl. at ¶ 9.]

Third, those of ordinary skill in the art expected that Fab fragments would not be effective because they would be cleared before the venom. Many venom toxins are large, hydrophobic molecules, and they are usually injected deep into subcutaneous tissues. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 30; Smith Decl. at ¶ 8.] These individual toxins are

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

released slowly from the injection site, resulting in the "venom depot effect" whereby the venom toxins continue to be released into the circulatory system long after th initial bite. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 30; Smith Decl. at ¶ 8.] Venom protein continu s to be released from the injection site for weeks [Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 5(a)], and has been detected in a patient 46 days after envenomation. [Owenby et al., *Southern Medical Journal* (1990).]

Fab fragments have a molecular weight of around 45-55 Kd. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 31.] This relatively small size allows the renal system to remove Fab fragments, resulting in a half-life of about 17 hours. [*Id.*] Indeed, the renal system completely eliminates Fab fragments in only 24-26 hours. [*Id.*]

$F(ab)_2$ fragments, in contrast, are about twice as large as Fab fragments–too large for the renal system to remove them. [*Id.* at ¶ 32.] Thus, they have a much longer half-life than Fab fragments, approximately 50 hours versus approximately 17 hours. [*Id.*] Given the renal system's rapid removal of Fab fragments, especially compared to $F(ab)_2$ fragments, and the venom depot effect, those of ordinary skill in the art expected that there would be no remaining Fab fragments to neutralize later-released venom toxins. [*Id.* at ¶ 32; Smith Decl. at ¶ 8.]

2. Before Appellants' Invention, Antivenoms Comprising Fab Fragments Were Actually Expected to Be Harmful

Not only did those of ordinary in the skill in the art believe that Fab fragments would be ineffective before Appellants' invention, they actually expected that such an antivenom could increase the lethality of the snake venom by redistributing and concentrating its toxins. [Russell Decl. at ¶ 33; Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 13.] Th binding of

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Fab fragments and venom toxins is a dynamic process, having an equilibrium where individual venom toxins are constantly bound and released. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 34.] The renal system's rapid removal of Fab fragments, however, continually decreases the number of Fab fragments remaining to bind the venom toxins. [Smith Decl. at ¶ 8.] Those of ordinary skill in the art were concerned that Fab fragments would bind venom toxins that were released into the circulatory system and then release the venom toxins at another site, perhaps concentrating the venom toxins in areas of high blood flow like the kidneys, heart, nervous system, and lungs. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 36; Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 5(b).] As Dr. Sullivan stated,

> I and others maintained and discussed our concerns that Fab[fragments] would redistribute toxic venom proteins throughout the body, thus producing venom pathology at tissue sites and organ systems not typically seen in patients treated with [whole antibodies] or $F(ab)_2$.

[Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 7.] While the toxins might have caused swelling and local necrosis at the site of envenomation, the predicted redistribution and concentration of venom toxins might result in "coagulopathy, direct cardiotoxicity, liver and kidney damage, potential central nervous system, and peripheral nervous system damage." [*Id.*] Thus, what had been a systemic toxicity with venom toxins being released slowly into the circulation could become a localized toxicity with venom toxins being concentrated in the kidneys, heart, nervous system, and lungs by this "taxi" effect. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 36; Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 5(a).]

This taxi effect was predicted, and it was a reason why those of ordinary skill in the art did not progress beyond the known $F(ab)_2$ fragments to the smaller Fab fragments. [Sullivan Decl. at ¶ 7.] According to Dr. Sullivan, the use of Fab fragments to treat envenomation would have been "medically unsound and contraindicated." [*Id.*

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

at ¶ 13.] The belief of those of ordinary skill in the art that Fab fragments would actually increase the lethality of snake venom by concentrating high molecular w ight snake toxins in areas of high blood flow was not a merely theoretical concern, as Faulstich *et al.* later demonstrated.

Faulstich *et al.* (Strongly Enhanced Toxicity of the Mushroom Toxin α-Amanitin by an Amatoxin-Specific Fab or Monoclonal Antibody. 26 *Toxicon* 491 (1988) (copy attached as Exhibit 7 to first Russell Declaration)] conducted a series of studies attempting to treat α-amatoxin poisoning with Fab fragments. Alpha-amatoxin is a high molecular weight toxin that is similar to some snake venom toxins. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 37.] As a high molecular weight toxin, α-amatoxin cannot be cleared by the renal system. [*Id.*] Rather, like many snake toxins, it is cleared by the liver. [*Id.*] Since α-amatoxin is concentrated in the liver after oral ingestion, it is primarily toxic to liver cells. [*Id.*]

Faulstich *et al.* discovered that the Fab fragments did not decrease the toxicity of α-amatoxin in mice, but rather increased the toxicity of α-amatoxin by a factor of 50. [*Faulstich et al.* at p. 497.] Furthermore, the Fab fragments resulted in α-amatoxin being specifically toxic to kidney cells rather than liver cells. [*Id.*] This is exactly what one of ordinary skill in the art would have predicted. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 38.] Th Fab fragments bound the high molecular weight α-amatoxin, and then unbound it in their state of equilibrium at sites of high blood flow. [*Id.*] This unbinding at sites of high blood flow, especially the kidneys, resulted in the α-amatoxin being concentrated in these tissues and killing them. [*Id.*] Thus, Fab fragments greatly increased the

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

toxicity of this high molecular weight toxin by concentrating it in areas of high blood flow.

Faulstich *et al's* results with Fab fragment directed to a high molecular weight toxin stood in contrast to Balthazar *et al.'s* results with Fab fragments to the low molecular weight toxin digoxin. [Balthazar *et al.* (1994) Utilization of Antidrug Antibody Fragments for the Optimization of Intraperitoneal Drug Therapy: Studies Using Digoxin as a Model Drug. *J. Pharm. Exp. Ther.* 268, 734 (attached at Exhibit 8 to the First Russell Declaration).] Digoxin is unlike most Crotalidae venom toxins; it is a very small molecule; small enough that the renal system can clear the Fab-digoxin complex. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 39; Smith Decl. at ¶¶ 8, 10.] Since the renal system can filter the Fab-digoxin complex, the Fab fragments did not redistribute and concentrate digoxin, as one of ordinary skill in the art would have predicted. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 39.] Accordingly, Balthazar *et al.* found that Fab fragments effectively treated digoxin toxicity, just as Smith *et al.*, upon which the Examiner relies, found.

However, Balthazar *et al.* recognized the potential problems of Fab therapy for large toxins, like α-amatoxin and some Crotalidae venom toxins:

> First, the alteration of drug distribution which accompanies antibody drug complexation may result in a **potentiation of drug toxicities** or the development of **new drug toxicities in certain cases** . . . . The risk of **redistributing systemic toxicity**, rather than minimizing systemic toxicity, should be appreciated as a potential outcome of the proposed approach.

[Balthazar *et al.* at p. 738, cols. 1-2; emphasis added.]

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Accordingly, those of ordinary skill in the art were conc rned that treatment with an antivenom comprising Fab fragments would actually be harmful for the treatment of high molecular weight venom toxins because the Fab fragments would redistribute high molecular weight toxins to areas of high blood flow, creating new toxicities. Faulstich *et al.* confirmed this concern with a toxin that is of a similar molecular weight as many snake venom toxins. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 41.] Balthazar *et al.* reinforced this concern by showing that this effect did not occur with a low molecular weight toxin that the renal system could clear as part of an Fab-toxin complex. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 42.] Indeed, despite the effectiveness of their treatment, Balthazar *et al.* specifically discussed their concern that Fab fragments might alter drug toxicities or redistribute systemic toxicities.

These *in vivo* mechanisms that led those of ordinary skill in the art to expect that the claimed invention would not be effective show that the Examiner's reliance upon the Coulter *et al.* reference for teaching that Fab fragments have a higher sensitivity than whole antibody in *in vitro* tests is misplaced. Coulter *et al.* did not treat envenomation with their Fab fragments. Rather, Coulter *et al.* first mixed textilotoxin with their Fab fragments *in vitro*. [Coulter *et al.* at p. 201, 3rd full paragraph.] Coulter *et al.* then injected the already bound Fab-textilotoxin complex intravenously. This treatment with Fab fragments resulted in neutralization that was essentially equivalent to the treatment with the IgG fragments, just as one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 48.] Since the Fab-textilotoxin mixture was first mixed *in vitro* and then injected intravenously, the Fab did not have the opportunity to redistribute and concentrate the textilotoxin in high blood flow parts.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

[*Id.*] Accordingly, the Coulter *et al.* reference would not have provided a reasonable expectation of success for an antivenom comprising Fab fragments to any venom toxins, despite the Examiner's assertion to the contrary. [*Id.*]

Once again, this was not a merely theoretical concern, as Sorkine *et al.* later demonstrated. Sorkine *et al.* conducted a similar experiment in 1983 by mixing Fab fragments with a snake venom before injecting the mixture into a mouse, and they obtained similar results. [Sorkine *et al.* (1995) Comparison of $F(ab')_2$ and Fab Efficiency on Plasma Extravasation Induced *Viper aspis* Venom. *Toxicon* 33, 257 (attached as Exhibit 11 to the First Russell Declaration).] This treatment resulted in a considerable reduction in capillary permeability. However, the Fab fragments were much less effective when they were administered *in vivo* separately from the venom. As Sorkine *et al.* state "these data showed firstly that the *in vitro* neutralization of the venom by immunoglobulin fragments does not reflect their *in vivo* efficiency." [Sorkine *et al.* at 257.] Thus, the Sorkine *et al.* reference shows that one would not have expected Coulter *et al.*'s *in vitro* neutralization results to predict the effectiveness of antivenoms comprising Fab fragments *in vivo*. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 50.]

3. One of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Have Extrapolated Coulter et al.'s Results with the Single Venom Toxin Textilotoxin to Whole Venoms

Coulter *et al.* used textilotoxin, one of several toxins in the venom of the Australian brown snake (*Pseudonaja textilis*). [Coulter *et al.* at p. 199, last sentence; First Russell Decl. at ¶ 46.] The pending claims recite a snake of the genus Crotalus, a genus of the family Crotalidae. As can be seen from its name, the snake Coulter *et al.* used is not a member of the genus Crotalus, nor is it even of the same family as the

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Crotalus genus. Rather, it is a member of the genus *Pseudonaja*. [Coulter *et al.* at 199.] Indeed, Coulter *et al.'s* snake is an elapid [Russell (1996) Toxic Effects of Animal Toxins. In *Casarett and Doull's Toxicology: The Basic Science of Poisons*, (5th Ed.) at p. 802 (attached as Exhibit 10 to the First Russell Declaration)], and the elapids are of the family Elapidae, not Crotalidae. [*Snake Venom Poisoning* at p. 5.]

Furthermore, while it might now appear to the Board, after having read Appellants' disclosure, to be obvious to combine Coulter *et al.'s* teaching concerning Fab fragments with Sullivan *et al.'s* antivenom, "hindsight is not a justifiable basis on which to find" that an invention was obvious. *Amgen v. Chugai Pharm. Co. Ltd.*, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Rather, the prior art, not Appellants' disclosure, must have provided a reasonable expectation of success. *Id.* at 1022; *In re Vaeck*, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438, 1442 (Fed. Cir. 1991). This rejection, however, depends upon a hindsight-aided application of the teachings from Appellants' disclosure, not the prior art. The evidence Appellants have submitted shows that this rejection fails for a lack of the required expectation of success.

Textilotoxin is simply **a single toxin** from Australian brown snake venom. Although venoms can be simple substances, as in some marine animals, in snakes they are often very complicated mixtures of many individual toxins. [First Russell Decl. at. ¶ 15, ¶ 47; Smith Decl. at ¶ 6.] In some venoms of Crotalus snakes, there may be 100 different protein fractions. [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 15.] Due to their complexity, the full composition of snake venoms is unknown. [*Id.*] Not only is the composition of snake venoms complicated and their exact composition unknown, but the pharmacological eff cts of some constituent toxins are unknown. [*Id.* at ¶ 16.]

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Due to the unknown composition of snake venoms and the unknown effect of even the identified toxins in snake venoms, basic toxicology texts caution against extrapolating results from individual venom toxins (like Coulter *et al.*'s) to whole venoms (like the claims recite). [*Toxic Effects of Animal Toxins* at p. 802; *Snake Venom Poisoning* at p. 168.] Accordingly, the Board is incorrect in attempting to extrapolate Coulter *et al.*'s results with Fab fragments to a single snake venom toxin to the results that would have been expected with Fab fragments to an entire snake venom comprising many unknown toxins of unknown effect. As Dr. Russell stated, "one would not have expected Coulter *et al.*'s results with Fab to a single **toxin** to predict similar results with Fab to a Crotalidae snake **venom**, including a Crotalus snake **venom**." [First Russell Decl. at ¶ 47; emphasis in original.]

Since Coulter *et al.* used Fab fragments to a toxin from the venom of a snake of a different genus than the claims recite, and since one of ordinary skill in the art would not have expected results with Fab fragments to a single venom toxin to predict what would occur with an antivenom comprising Fab fragments to an entire Crotalus venom, any rejection relying upon the Coulter *et al.* reference must fail. Not only was there no reasonable expectation of success based upon the Coulter et al. reference before Appellants' invention, there was no reasonable expectation of success in using Fab antivenom fragments based upon *any* references, including Sullivan et al., Coulter et al., and Smith et al.

In sum, prior to Appellants' invention, those of ordinary skill in the art did not have a reasonable expectation of success that an antivenom comprising Fab fragments to Crotalus venom would be effective. Obviousness requires that "[b]oth the

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

suggestion and the reasonable expectation of success must be founded in the prior art, not [Appellants'] disclosure," *Vaeck*, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1442, and Appellants have shown that that is not the case here. Despite the known problems with the commercially available venom for Crotalus envenomation since 1947, and the well-known fact that smaller immunoglobulin fragments are less immunogenic, those of ordinary skill in the art had not progressed beyond antivenoms comprising the disappointing $F(ab)_2$ fragments to the smaller Fab fragments because they expected Fab fragments to be not just ineffective, but actually more harmful to the patient that no treatment at all.

For all these reasons, the combination of Sullivan and Coulter would not have taught one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare an antivenom pharmaceutical composition for treating a snakebite victim, comprising Fab, wherein the antivenom pharmaceutical composition neutralizes the lethality of the venom of a snake of the Crotalus genus. Because Appellants have amended the claims to clearly recite a pharmaceutical activity for the claimed antivenom—as invited by the Board—Appellants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional requires fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 31, 2003

By: Michael T. Siekman
Michael T. Siekman
Reg. No. 36,276

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

APPENDIX

40. (Three times amended) An antivenom pharmaceutical composition for treating a snakebite victim, comprising Fab fragments which bind specifically to a venom of a snake of the Crotalus genus and which are essentially free from contaminating Fc as determined by immunoelectrophoresis using anti-Fc antibodies, and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, wherein said antivenom pharmaceutical composition neutralizes the lethality of the venom of a snake of the Crotalus genus.

41. (Twice Amended) The antivenom pharmaceutical composition of claim 40, wherein an antibody source for said Fab fragments is IgG(T).

42. (Twice Amended) The antivenom pharmaceutical composition of claim 40, wherein an antibody source for said Fab fragments is polyvalent IgG(T).

48. (New) The antivenom pharmaceutical composition of claim 40, wherein the Fab fragments are equine.

49. (New) The antivenom pharmaceutical composition of claim 40, wherein the antivenom pharmaceutical composition is lyophilized.

50. (New) The antivenom pharmaceutical composition of claim 40, further comprising thimerosal.

51. (New) An antivenom pharmaceutical composition for treating a snakebite victim, comprising Fab_2 fragments which bind specifically to a venom of a snake of the Crotalus genus and which are essentially free from contaminating Fc as determined by immunoelectrophoresis using anti-Fc antibodies, and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, wherein said antivenom pharmaceutical composition neutralizes the lethality of the venom of a snake of the Crotalus genus.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

52. (N w) A method of treating envenomation by a snak of the Crotalus genus comprising administering the antivenom pharmaceutical composition of any on of claims 40-42 and 48-51.

53. (New) The method of claim 52, wherein the antivenom pharmaceutical composition is administered intravenously.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com